UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,264	10/12/2001	Tsukasa Saito	500.40756X00	8841

24956 7590 12/13/2005	EXAMINER
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	TO, BAO TRAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/975,264	SAITO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bao Tran N. To	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 September 2005</u>.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5 and 6</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3-4 and 7-13</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-2 and 5-6</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action responds to the applicant's amendment filed on 09/20/2005.

Applicant amended Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 and cancelled Claims 3-4 and 7-13. Claims 1,

2, 5 and 6 remain for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 09/20/2005 with respect to the rejections based on

Sloo and Cogger have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, "These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to a

provider side processing apparatus connected to a network, or a deliberation-requesting party-side

processing apparatus accenting an input designating sent-out contents, capable of being browsed, as

recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest

anything related to a browser, as recited in the claims of the present application."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with this above contention. Sloo clearly

discloses "Fig. 1, the complaint handling apparatus 10 broadly includes a central

computer 12 and plurality of access terminals 14 coupled with the central computer by a

communications network 16" (col. 3, lines 5-20). Furthermore, Sloo explicitly discloses

"the computer program interface is preferably written in a Standard Generalized Mark-

Up Language (SGML) such as Hypertext language. The mark-up language cooperates

with a standard server language such as Common Gateway Interface (CGI) or Practical

Extraction and Report Language (PERL) for handling the various operation functions of

the central computer" (col. 3, lines 55-60).

Therefore, the access terminals 10 are coupled with central computer 12 by communication network 16. Moreover, the computer program interface prompts the user to enter data needed to search and retrieve the information over the network. Furthermore, Sloo discloses the central computer (a provider-side processing apparatus that accepts input designating sent out-contents) allows for records it keeps to be searched and viewed (col. 4, lines 1-45 and col. 5, lines 5, lines 55-65).

Applicant further argues that the Sloo reference neither discloses nor suggests the limitation wherein personal information is transmitted "when the deliberation result indicates that the sent-out contents include an illegality". Examiner disagrees. After a judgment is rendered, an email is sent out, which would necessarily have personal contact information (Sloo, col. 9, lines 10-15). Furthermore, Sloo suggests that the disclosed system is capable of handling matters of law, which would logically requires a determination of illegality to be made (Sloo col. 16, lines 25-67).

Applicant argues against the combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations of Sloo and Cogger. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Sloo and Cogger are indeed analogous art as both references are directed to the general purpose of reporting trouble incidents in the system (see Sloo, col. 5, lines 30-65 and Cogger, col. 4, lines 1-35).

Therefore, the rejection basis dated 06/24/2005 for Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sloo (U.S. Patent 5,895,450) herein referred to as Sloo and further in view of

Cogger et al (U.S. Patent 6,032,184) herein referred to as Cogger.

Regarding on Claims 1 and 6, Sloo discloses a personal information managing

method in a case of resolving a dispute occurred by information sent out from an

information processing apparatus, comprising the steps of:

accepting, by a deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus from a

deliberation-requesting-party (access terminals), an input for designating sent-out

contents capable of being browsed on a provider-side (central computer) processing

apparatus connected via a network (communication network) (col. 3, lines 7-18);

receiving, by said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus,

information for identifying a sending-party sending out said designated sent-out

contents, from said provider-side processing apparatus, said information having been

issued by a ticket management process apparatus and not including personal

information on said sending-party (Unique e-mail address is given to identify the

complainant; i.e., sending-party) (col. 5, lines 12-28);

transmitting said sent-out contents and said information together with ticket

information for identifying a deliberation-requesting party from said deliberation-

requesting-party-side processing apparatus to a deliberation support (the program to

allow users to proceed by selecting options) processing apparatus to request a

deliberation ("Request a Judge/Jury") about said sent-out contents (col. 7, lines 28-40

and col. 8, lines 5-60); said information for identifying said deliberation-requesting-party

having been issued by said management processing apparatus and not including

personal information on said deliberation-requesting-party (col. 5, lines 12-28).

receiving, by said deliberation support processing apparatus, said sent-out

contents and both said information from said deliberation-requesting-party-side

processing apparatus to store said sent-out contents and both said information into a

deliberation managing database (complaint data record) in said deliberation support

processing apparatus (col. 8, lines 30-60), said sent-out contents becoming a target of

said deliberation (resolution of the complaint) (col. 8, lines 35-55);

accepting, by said deliberation support processing apparatus, an input by a

deliberation-responsible-party of a deliberation result (judgment) of said requested

deliberation to store said deliberation result into said deliberation managing database

(complaint data record) (col. 8, lines 50-60);

transmitting the deliberation result and said information for identifying said

sending-party together with the ticket information for identifying said deliberation-

responsible-party, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said

management processing apparatus (col. 9, lines 5-20);

to request presentation of said personal information on said sending-party

(personal e-mail address is entered by complainant), said information for identifying said

deliberation-responsible-party having been issued by said management processing

apparatus (col. 5, lines 10-30);

transmitting said personal information on said sending-party identified by said

information for identifying said sending party, from said management processing

apparatus to said deliberation support processing apparatus when said deliberation

result indicates that said sent-out contents include an illegality (violation of law) (col. 16,

lines 30-60); and

transmitting said deliberation result (judgment) stored in said deliberation

managing database (complaint data record) and said personal information on said

sending-party received from said management processing apparatus, from said

deliberation support processing apparatus to said deliberation-requesting-party-side

processing apparatus (col. 9, lines 5-15).

However, Sloo does not teach the individual apparatus, such as "deliberation

support processing apparatus and ticket management processing apparatus".

Nevertheless, Sloo teaches one programmed central computer of a complaint handling

apparatus provides the functionality of "deliberation support process and ticket

management process" (col. 1, lines 66-67 through col. 2, lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Sloo's invention to include deliberation support

processing apparatus and ticket management processing apparatus. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to allow users processing the complaints.

Sloo does not explicitly disclose the use of "a ticket management processing

apparatus".

However, Cogger discloses the ticket management processing apparatus (col. 4,

lines 9-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate Cogger's invention with Sloo to include

a ticket instead of the unique email with the motivation being to allow users to analyze

the complaints being recorded.

Regarding on Claim 2, Sloo and Cogger further disclose a personal information

managing method as claimed in Claim 1, comprising the step of:

accepting, by said deliberation support processing apparatus from said

deliberation-responsible-party, an input of inquiry contents (public search) toward said

sending-party (complainant) to store said inquiry contents into said deliberation

managing database (complaint data record) (col. 5, lines 55-65);

transmitting said inquiry contents and said ticket information, for identifying said

sending-party together with said ticket information for identifying said deliberation-

responsible party from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said ticket

management processing apparatus (col. 4, lines 45-60);

in response to said inquiry contents and both said ticket information (col. 4, lines

15-35);

thus received, making, by said ticket management processing apparatus,

reference to a mail address indicated by as a contact address (e-mail) included in said

personal information for identifying said sending-party ; and transmitting said inquiry

contents from said ticket management processing apparatus to said mail address (col.

9, lines 5-15).

Regarding on Claim 5, Sloo discloses a personal information managing system in

a case of resolving a dispute occurred by information sent out from an information

processing apparatus, comprising:

a deliberation-requesting-party-side apparatus (access terminals) (col. 3 lines 5-

20); and

wherein said deliberation-requesting-party-side apparatus include a deliberation

request process unit for accepting, from a deliberation-requesting-party, an input for

designating sent-out contents capable of being browsed on a provider-side processing

apparatus connected via a network (communication network) (col. 3, lines 5-20),

receiving information for identifying a sending-party sending out said designated

sent-out contents, from said provider-side processing apparatus, said information

having been issued from said ticket management processing apparatus and not

including personal information on said sending-party (Unique e-mail address is given to

identify the complainant; i.e., sending-party) (col. 5, lines 12-28), and

for transmitting said sent-out contents and said information together with the

information for identifying a deliberation-requesting-party to said deliberation support

(the program to allow users to proceed by selecting options) processing apparatus to request a deliberation ("Request a Judge/Jury") about said sent-out contents (col. 8, lines 15-60, col. 10, lines 45-col. 11, line 20, and col.16, lines 30-65);

wherein a deliberation accepting process unit for receiving, by said deliberation support processing apparatus, said sent-out contents and said information from said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus to store said sent-out contents and both said information into a deliberation managing database in said deliberation support processing apparatus (col. 4, lines 1-60 and col. 5, lines 3-50), said sent-out contents becoming a target of said deliberation (resolution of the complaint) (col. 8, lines 35-55);

process unit for accepting, by said deliberation support processing apparatus, an input of a deliberation result (judgment) of said requested deliberation to store said deliberation result into said deliberation managing database, for transmitting said information stored in said deliberation managing database, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to a ticket management processing apparatus (col. 4, lines 10-35 and col. 5, lines 35-65), and for requesting, by said deliberation support processing apparatus, presentation of said personal information on said sending-party (personal e-mail address is entered by complainant) (col. 5, lines 20-30);

a personal information presenting process unit for receiving by said management processing apparatus, said information from said deliberation support processing apparatus (col. 5, lines 10-20), and

for transmitting said personal information on said sending-party identified by said

information for identifying said sending-party, from said management processing

apparatus to said deliberation support processing apparatus when said deliberation

result indicates that said sent-out contents include an illegality (violation of law) (col. 16,

lines 30-60); and

a deliberation result informing process unit for transmitting said deliberation result

stored in said deliberation managing database (complaint data record) and said

personal information on said sending-party received from said management processing

apparatus, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said deliberation-

requesting-party-side processing apparatus (col. 4, lines 45-60).

However, Sloo does not teach the individual apparatus, such as "deliberation

support processing apparatus and ticket management processing apparatus".

Nevertheless, Sloo teaches one programmed central computer of a complaint handling

apparatus provides the functionality of "deliberation support process and ticket

management process" (col. 1, lines 66-67 through col. 2, lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Sloo's invention to include deliberation support

processing apparatus and ticket management processing apparatus. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to allow users processing the complaints.

Sloo does not explicitly disclose the use of "a ticket management processing

apparatus".

However, Cogger discloses the ticket management processing apparatus (col. 4, lines 9-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Cogger's invention with Sloo to include a ticket instead of the unique email with the motivation being to allow users to analyze the complaints being recorded.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bao Tran N. To whose telephone number is 571-272-8156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Baotran To
12/07/2005

KIM VU
PATENT EXAM...
CENTER 21